



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
www.uspto.gov
1-800-553-7378
TTY: 1-800-787-6473
www.uspto.gov
www.uspto.gov/patent

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,909	01/05/2007	Shahad K. Govil	BERIK 3.0-025 DIV	3962

830 7500 08-29-2003
LERNER, DAVID, LITTBENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WEBMAN, EDWARD J.

[REDACTED] AR/CLK [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

[REDACTED] (617)

DATE MAILED: 08-29-2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/754909	Applicant(s) G O V I L
Examiner WEBMAN	Group Art Unit 1617

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE

3

MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on **5/27/03**
 This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) **1-84** is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s) **1-63, 81-84** is/are withdrawn from consideration.
Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 Claim(s) **69-80** is/are rejected.
Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Other _____

Office Action Summary

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 64-80 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 84-92 of copending Application No. 08/883,075. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are generic to '075 regarding properties of the active whereas the claims of '075 are generic to the instant claims regarding percent range of monomer.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 64-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mantelle et al '022.

Mantelle et al '022 teaches a transdermal comprising a liquid active and a polymer free of solvents (abstract), Duro-Tak 87-2852 disclosed (column 13 line 34), the polymer applicants specify (page 19 Table 2). 60% is disclosed (column 15 Table 6). Selegine is specified at 5-25% (column 3 lines 6-18). As to the claimed percent range crosslinker it is assumed Duro-TAK 87-2852 possesses an amount within the claimed range because applicants exemplify its use (page 42 paragraph 109).

Applicants cannot overcome a 102b rejection by swearing behind the reference cited (MPEP 2133.02). Therefore, applicants' Rule 131 affidavit^{v1} is moot.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward J. Webman whose telephone number is 308-4432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5pm.

Art Unit: 1617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, S. Padmanabhan can be reached on 305-1877. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 305-3592 for regular communications and 305-1235 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-1234.

Webman/tgd
August 11, 2003

A handwritten signature consisting of a vertical line with a small loop at the top and a diagonal line extending from the middle of the vertical line.